

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2005

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/658,140	09/09/2003	Ed H. Frank	14178US02	3008
23446	7590 02/08/2005		EXAM	INER
MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD			NGUYEN, VAN KIM T	
500 WEST N SUITE 3400	MADISON STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO,	L 60661		2661	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/658,140	FRANK ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Van Kim T. Nguyen	2661				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 (SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicat period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by reply received by the Office later than three months after the ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a ion. s, a reply within the statutory minimum of thi period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI attatute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	·						
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>September 09, 2003</u> .					
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□							
Applicati	on Papers		,				
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment	· ·	-					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94	4) Lanterview (Paper No(Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date				
3) 🔲 Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S r No(s)/Mail Date		nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2661

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 11, and 21 recite the limitation "said second access point" on line 9, 11, and 9, respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Claim 25 recites the limitation "one processor" on line 2, 3, 4, and 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Further, claims 3 and 6-10, as disclosed, are inconsistent with claim 1.

It is not clear whether the second messaging protocol message is received from the second switch as recited in claim 3 (lines 1-2), or from at least one of the first access point and the first switch as recited in claim 1 (lines 5-7).

It is not clear whether the first messaging protocol message is communicated between the first switch and the second switch as recited in claims 6-7, and 9-10, or between the first access point to the first switch as recited in claim 8, or between the first access point and a first switch as recited in claim 1 (lines 5-7).

Similarly, claims 13 and 16-20, as disclosed, are inconsistent with claim 11.

Similarly, claims 23 and 28-32, as disclosed, are inconsistent with claim 21

Application/Control Number: 10/658,140 Page 3

Art Unit: 2661

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 4. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 11-12, 14-15, 18, 21-22, 26-27, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rauhala (US 6,611,547).

Regarding claims 1, 11, and 21, as shown in Figure 1, Rauhala discloses a method for providing communication in a hybrid wired/wireless local area network, the method comprising:

sending a first messaging protocol message (signaling messages SETUP) between a first switch (10) and a first access point (BTS1), (col. 5: line 65 – col. 6: line 6);

responsive to the first messaging protocol message, receiving at least a second messaging protocol message (connection establishment signaling) from at least one of the first access point (BTS1) and the first switch (col. 6: lines 9-19); and

controlling at least one of the first switch (10), the first access point (BTS1), the second access point (BTS2), and at least one of a plurality of access devices (MS) using the second messaging protocol message (e.g., command BTS2 sending cells to MS over connection 13 established by BTS1), (col. 6: lines 15-26).

Art Unit: 2661

Though Rauhala does not specifically call for a second switch, but Rauhala discloses a virtual connection 14 over the ATM switch and the ATM network to another party, inherently another (second) switch (col. 5: lines 32-34).

Regarding claims 2, 12, and 22, Rauhala also discloses generating the first messaging protocol message (signaling message SETUP) by the first switch (col. 5: line 65 – col. 6: line 1).

Regarding claims 4, 14, and 26, Rauhala also discloses at least one of the first message protocol messages (signaling message SETUP) is an access point status message communicated between the first switch (10) and one of the first access point (BTS1), the second access point (BTS2), and the second switch (col. 5: line 63 – col. 6: line 6).

Regarding claims 5, 15, and 27, Rauhala also discloses at least one of the first messaging protocol messages (signaling message SETUP) is at least one access point configuration message (having an end point address BTS2) communicated from at least one of the first switch (10) to at least one of the first access point (BTS1) and the second access point (BTS2), (col. 5: line 63 – col. 6: line 6).

Regarding claims 8, 18, and 30, Rauhala also discloses at least one of the third messaging protocol messages (response signaling) is at least one client status message communicated from at least one of the first access point (BTS1) and the second access point (BTS2), to at least one of the first switch (10) and the second switch (response signaling from BTS2 is transmitted via BTS1 to switch 10; col. 6: lines 20-21).

Application/Control Number: 10/658,140

Art Unit: 2661

Conclusion

Page 5

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Van Kim T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3073. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau T. Nguyen, can be reached on 571-272-3126. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

vkn February 4, 2005

CHAU NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Chu To Marie